

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-12, 14-15, and 17-22 have been amended.

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claims 1, 10, 17 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The limitations “determining a context of the document” and “modifying, responsive to the context, the document to generate a modified document,” as recited in claims 1, 10 and 17, are supported by the specification as filed. For example, paragraph 121 states that URLs “are modified based on the type of URL, what context the web page exists in, and which UI is being used by the user” (emphasis added).

The limitation “the context comprises one of a group containing a page preview, a local publish, an external publish, a local stage, and an external stage,” as recited in claims 23-25, is also supported by the specification as filed. For example, paragraph 122 states: “There are four contexts: template preview, page preview, local stage or publish, and external stage or publish.”

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bernardo. Applicants respectfully traverse. As amended, claim 1 recites:

A computer implemented method of generating a document, comprising:  
providing a first user interface configured to specify a document template;  
providing a second user interface configured to specify a content file  
related to the document template;  
combining the document template and the content file to generate the  
document;  
determining a context of the document which identifies a location of the  
document; and  
modifying, responsive to the context, the document to generate a modified  
document.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of generating a document. The generated document can be accessed in a variety of contexts, including local/external publish, local/external stage, and preview. These contexts can affect the document's location, such as where the document is stored in a directory structure and on which server.

Sometimes the document includes functionality that depends on the document's location. For example, a relative URL (e.g., starting with "/" or "../") indicates a location relative to a web page's location, while an absolute URL (e.g., starting with "http://") does not. In this situation, moving the document can interfere with the functionality. Thus, the document may need to be modified in order for the desired functionality to be preserved in the new location. Because the context of the document can affect the document's location, it follows that a document may need to be modified based on its context.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "determining a context of the document which identifies a location of the document" and "modifying, responsive to the context, the document." Bernardo does not disclose, suggest, or teach these elements. Bernardo discusses creating a web page and then modifying it to add a link to a related help page (13: 41-56). However, this modification is not responsive to the context (namely, the location) of the document. Instead, the modification is based on the content of the web page, so that the link points to a help page that is related to the content of the web page. Nowhere does Bernardo disclose "determining a context of the document which identifies a location of the document," let alone "modifying, responsive to the context, the document."

Accordingly, claim 1 (as amended) is patentable over Bernardo. Claims 10 and 17 also recite similar features and are also patentable over Bernardo for at least the foregoing reasons.

The claims not specifically mentioned above incorporate the features of their respective base claims and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
DIETRICH W. SCHULTZ, ET AL.

Dated: 7-18-05

By: Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale  
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No. 55,687  
Attorney for Applicant  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax: (650) 938-5200